

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1971 - 76

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) FIRST SESSION OF 1971 - 76 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12th February, 1974.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.05 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS; His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (deputy Speaker); Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A.(Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport).

Prayers were read.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Minutes for Tuesday, the 29th January, 1974 are ready for confirmation. There being no corrections, amendments or alterations the Minutes for Tuesday, the 29th January, 1974, are hereby duly confirmed.

DOCUMENTS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Planning I am commanded to lay

(1) The Customs Duties (Deeps Trading Company Limited) Order, 1973.

(2) The Drawback of Duties (Polypropylene Bags) (Sugar Industry) Regulations, 1973.

(3) The Air Service Agreement between the Government of Barbados and the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. A. MORRISON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$188, 459 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74 Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1973-74, No. 34, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. L. S. CRAIG entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$165, 821 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74 Part I -Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1973-74, No. 35, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$71, 308 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1973-74, No. 36, which form the Schedule to the Resolution;

Also on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$57, 946 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74 Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1973-74 No. 37, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914.

On my own behalf I beg to give notice of a Bill to implement the Agreement to which Barbados is a party, between certain countries in the Caribbean region for the harmonisation of fiscal incentives to industry.

Also, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1968.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution—

WHEREAS the Government is considering (a) the establishment of a Sewerage Plant in Emmerton Lane in the City of Bridgetown; (b) the removal of the residents of the Emmerton Lane area, City of Bridgetown;

AND WHEREAS it is a fundamental right of the said residents of the above mentioned area that they should be consulted and have a say in determining their future;

BE IT RESOLVED that this Honourable House calls upon the Government to conduct a Public Enquiry so that the residents of the Emmerton Area, City of Bridgetown will be afforded ample opportunity for the full and frank discussion on the matter of the proposed establishment of the Sewerage Plant at Emmerton Lane, City of Bridgetown and the removal of the said residents from the Emmerton Lane Area.

Mr. W. C. B. HINDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution

WHEREAS there is an urgent shortage of feed;

AND WHEREAS the energy crisis has aggravated this shortage;

AND WHEREAS the farmers in Barbados are concerned about the marketing of their produce at reasonable returns to them;

AND WHEREAS the world price of grain continues to spiral resulting in the heavy increases in the cost of animal feed;

AND WHEREAS the prices offered farmers locally for the animal protein diet do not reflect the cost of production, therefore resulting in heavy losses to the farmers;

AND WHEREAS imported commodities for which substitution is available locally are yet permitted to be brought into the country without the necessary consideration being given to the fact that the use of such substitution would reduce our very unfavourable Balance of Payments and generate additional employment thus reducing the incidence of unemployment in the country;

AND WHEREAS farmers experience heavy losses from their crops (a) because of the lack of irrigation and (b) the fact that they can only plant during the rainy season, thus resulting in large gluts of certain food crops at certain times of the year;

AND WHEREAS the incidence of swine fever and the price structuring of pork and pigs, immediately following the epidemic, did nothing to encourage local production of pork;

AND WHEREAS local farmers need to be assured of a market, with minimum prices, not below the cost of production, to them,

AND WHEREAS there is a dearth of Agro Industries in the country which would assist in removing the gluts and shortages from the market, encourage greater production and generate more employment;

AND WHEREAS there are currently only seven Extension Officers and a general shortage of experts in the Ministry of Agriculture to service approximately 26, 000 farmers;

AND WHEREAS technical advice in the field of agriculture is considered necessary for the production and development of agriculture;

I AND WHEREAS not all school children are given instructions in the field of agriculture;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House take note of the above mentioned infelicities and call on the Government to produce a White Paper on the development of agriculture in the country for the next five years, to equally satisfy the need of the producers and the consumers..

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Question in the name of the hon. Member for St. Joseph re the reasonable price for locally produced products.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister

Would the Minister forthwith permit and publish reasonable farm gate prices corresponding to the increase in production cost for locally produced farm produce in order to stimulate the increase in locally produced foods and to maintain reasonable supplies through the coming months?

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister Would the Minister state

(a) The number of beds supplied to the Royal Barbados Police Force since the Commission of Enquiry into the Police Force recommended that cots should be replaced by beds;

(b) The number of policemen stationed at each police post and the number of beds supplied to each post;

(c) Has every policeman been given a bed?

If the answer is in the negative, would the Minister state the reason why all policemen have not yet been supplied with beds? 12.15p.m.

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister-Is the Minister aware:

(1) That the entrance to the District "E" Police Station, Speightstown, causes great difficulty to motor vehicles entering and leaving those premises;

(2) That the difficulty is caused by the presence of a wall which runs along the Southern end of the said entrance;

Would the Minister cause an investigation to be made and take the necessary steps to remove or lower the said wall and widen the entrance to the said station?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

(a) Is the Minister aware that despite the existence of 4-H clubs in Barbados there are no visible signs of the locations of such club rooms and/or indications of their members' residences?

(b) Would the Minister therefore state:

(a) The number of registered 4-H clubs in the country;

(b) The total number of clubs in each parish;

(c) the total membership of each 4-H club?

(c) Would the Minister consider

(1) the creating of plaques to mark sites of 4-H club rooms;

(2) Signs to mark home of 4-H members and

(3) Badges for 4-H'ers, all in an effort to simulate and enhance the movement?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Would the Minister cause an investigation to be carried out into the use of plastic pipe for high pressure mains and report the results to this Honourable House?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-In view of the fact that

1. According to recent publications of the Barbados Marketing Corporation that the institution has

appointed to its staff Contract Officers and other personnel who will advise farmers in this country how, when, and what food crops to plant, and give general advice in agriculture;

That the Agricultural Development Corporation also has its own personnel dealing in agriculture;

Would the Minister state:

(a) What is now the function of the extension officers of the Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology.

(b) How many extension officers are presently employed by the department.

(c) Is the work of the extension service co-ordinated with other agricultural divisions of Government?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

In view of the fact that the Belleplaine, St. Andrew Bridge now being referred to as Dr. Smythe Bridge, which was washed away in 1970 is being repaired in 1974, would the Minister state how soon Government intends to carry out repairs to the bridge in St. Sylvan's Village in St. Joseph which has been washed away since 1958 and has had no work done to it since that date?

Is the Minister aware that the non-availability of the use of this bridge has caused great strain and inconvenience to the residents of the St. Sylvan's Village and surrounding areas?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-

Would the Minister state:

(a) What steps are being taken to train an adequate number of persons as inseminators in order to properly service the cattle industry in this country;

(b) Why was the supply of liquid nitrogen at the Central Livestock Station allowed to go below the safety level;

(c) When were the containers replenished;

(d) From where was the new supply obtained;

What is the relationship existing between the Trinidad suppliers and the Central livestock Station;

(f) Whether or not the Central Livestock Station owe the Trinidad suppliers any amount for the supply of Liquid Nitrogen gas?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister:-Is the Minister aware

1. That the highway which passes through Watt's Village in the Parish of Saint George is bounded by

high walls on both sides.

2. That there are two bus stops on either side of the said highway within the same area.
3. That the bus stops are so placed that they create a danger for intending passengers awaiting buses while other traffic is using the same highway.
4. That at least two (2) persons have lost their lives and several persons have been injured in this area, by being crushed against the said high walls by motor vehicles using the highway.
5. That at least one of the bus stops is so placed in relation to a curve that intending passengers have to stand on the opposite side of the road to see approaching buses and then have to cross the highway to reach the bus stop — thus creating a potential hazard to life and vehicular traffic.

In view of the above: Would the Minister

1. Cause lay-bys to be created in the walls in this highway in the areas where the bus stops are located.
2. Make the said bus stops "Compulsory stops" so as to facilitate intending passengers.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act, 1914, was read a first time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT entered the Chamber and took his seat.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to implement the Agreement to which Barbados is a party, between certain countries in the Caribbean region for the harmonisation of fiscal incentives to industry, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act, 1968, was read a first time.

OBITUARY SPEECHES RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY RE THE LATE GARFIELD ERROL SARGEANT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the passing of one of our colleagues, a former member of the Democratic Labour Party, a former Member of this Assembly, a former Deputy Speaker in the House for the period 1966 to 1971. I refer to the passing of the late Garfield Errol Sargeant, a former Magistrate and Attorney-at-Law who died quite recently at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital at the very early age of 54.

Mr. Garfield Sargeant or "Garry" as he was familiarly called among his many friends including your humble servant, was a very humble, courteous, kind and friendly man who had a very pleasant personality, and had a quality which I am afraid, is going out of existence today. He was just the reverse: of the present tempo of the day where you find that these qualities of life are being ignored and crushed aside as though they are wrong in practice. I can say of the late Mr. Garfield Errol Sargeant that he really set a standard in many respects both at the Bar and outside. He had an office adjoining mine when he first came back here and I have had a lot to do with him over the early years of his practice, and I must say that the efficient manner in which he handled his legal business is quite contrary to some legal practitioners who have things hanging for months and, years and come to no conclusion, and eventually you have to start all over again. Mr. Sargeant was just the reverse of that. He handled his business very expeditiously, and he always, I believe got results.

As Deputy Speaker, I must say that he set a standard here which many of us can hardly forget for many years to come. When he made a ruling, probably very much like yourself, he was firm and his ruling had to stand. 12:23 p.m.

He was respected by both Government and Opposition, and I must say that as Deputy Speaker he really excelled many Deputy Speakers I have seen for the 27 years I have been in here as a Member for Christ Church, I hope that his widow will not take his passing too badly.

I happen to have met him in the Intensive

Care Unit, two months ago and I realised that things were going the wrong way, because I understand that he was told that whenever he felt ill, he should go to the Intensive Care Unit. I think we all here will mourn his loss. I think that each and every one of us irrespective of which Party we belong to, will mourn the loss of the late Garfield Errol Sargeant, a prominent member of this community. I need not go into all his achievements, but he had a very good education, he qualified at Gray's Inn, London, he was a former pupil teacher and a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force. Through his own ambition, he strove to become an attorney-at-law with the help of his widow, and he worked with the Crown Agents in London. He was a Member of the Barbados House of Assembly from 1966 to 1971 and was Deputy Speaker for the entire period. He has also represented Barbados in many facets abroad and has made his mark. He has left a good impression on people not only in Barbados but abroad.

I beg to move that the following Resolution do now pass:

RESOLVED that this House place on record its profound sympathy concerning the death of Mr. Garfield Errol Sargeant, a former Member of Parliament, a former Deputy Speaker of the Honourable the House of Assembly, and a representative for the parish of St. Philip.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to his widow and to his sorrowing relatives.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Opposition to second this motion. I do so with some degree of sorrow because in my practice at the Bar, "Garry", as he was known to all of us, was of tremendous help, to me and also to most, if not all, the younger members of the Bar of this country, I remember him

especially when I arrived in London in 1958 on a very cold night in winter, the very first person I saw and recognised was "Garry", and, that brought some degree of warmth to, my heart. In my early days as a student, he assisted me to a great extent, and indeed he was with me on the first occasion when I got through the first part of my Bar Examinations. Throughout my career, and indeed throughout the careers of other members of the Bar, he has always been of great assistance.

I know that members of the legal profession will mourn his loss, a loss which cannot really be measured. His achievements as a criminal advocate were well known, and throughout the 60s after the Prime Minister left the legal scene, he dominated the criminal Bar and perhaps was like a Colossus to most other members practicing criminal law at that stage. Throughout the number of years he practised at the Bar, he was always one who fought the cause of his clients, but in doing so, he never disrespected either his colleagues or the Bench, and I have never known any occasion that "Garry" has had any quarrel either with his fellow practitioners, with the Magisterial Bench or with the Supreme Court Bench.

As I said before, his passing cannot really be measured, and it is a sad blow to the legal profession of this country. Those of us who have had the experience of hearing him in court would know that he was a personality who dominated the court-room with his thrust in cross-examination as a tactician in the criminal courts before juries. He was superb and possessed that wit and talent that very few people possess. It was only last Thursday that we drove together from District "B" Court where he was then the Magistrate, and we had a long conversation about the old times when he was at the Bar.

I join, in seconding this motion, in extending condolences to his ageing mother and to his widow.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, when a Member of this House has the painful task of eulogising a late colleague who represented the same parish at the same time, it reminds him of his own destiny. Mr. Garfield Enrol Sargeant represented the Parish of St. Philip from 1966 to 1971. Mr. Speaker, you, Sir, will recall that in those days representatives were elected under the system of Double Member Constituencies. The late Garfield Sargeant was introduced to me a few weeks before the election by certain members of the Democratic Labour Party. He ran for the House of Assembly under the auspices of the Democratic Labour Party with no acquaintance of the electors of the Parish. I had the colossal task of introducing him to almost every home in the parish of St. Philip and he later became a favourite of the people, having been returned to the House of Assembly as junior Member for the Parish with the highest percentage of votes which any junior Member ever received in this House of Assembly. 12.35p.m.

It was during that campaign that I found out his approach to politics. The impression he gave, was one of sincerity and honesty of purpose. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are aware that to be a representative of the people in the House of Assembly one has to have patience and must be willing and ready at all times to make sacrifices of almost everything to serve the people. You, no doubt, will substantiate me on this statement.

It does seem to me that the late Mr. Garfield Sargeant had other commitments which demanded his attention, and therefore he was sincere when he did not offer his services to the people of St. Philip for the second term. That was his decision, and not the decision of the people.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of St. Philip, you, and me, Sir, although I know that you too will say a few words, I extend to his dear widow and his loving mother my deepest sympathy. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion pass without saying something in respect of the late Garfield Errol Sargeant. To those who knew him well, and knew his family, particularly his mother, he was Garfield "Elroy" Sargeant because that was the pet name by which he was called by his mother.

I first met him in 1950 at a time when I never thought that I would have entered Parliament or had any thoughts or wishes of becoming a barrister. I believe that at that time, he was not thinking either that he would have become the criminal lawyer who ruled the roost in Barbados as we knew him to do even up to the time of his death.

I found him to be a man who was sincere. I can say that he liked helping people even at his own disadvantage. After that, we met again in London when he was then carrying out his studies in order to become a barrister, and he said to me, "I never knew that I would have met you here. I promise you that when you come back, I will back you."

I came back qualified as a barrister without making arrangements or provisions of sitting down even in a room far away from the Courts. Within one hour of my reaching home, he called me, saying that he must see me and that he would look after me according to his promise. He was a man for whom no question was ever too long, no problem ever too large that he would not spare enough time to tell a junior partner what he should do and where he was going wrong.

I remember practising before him only last week at the District "B" Police Court and he ruled against the Police. When the Sergeant began to answer, he said "Here are my notes, and these contain all the cases which would show that your argument is incorrect." Even to the Police, he had time to give them full assistance and help them in their work.

I say that today is a sad day for me. The late Mr. Sargeant has done for me perhaps more than he has done for any other practising barrister. I would like to extend to his mother and widow all condolence on the passing of a great man. I have spoken to his widow a few minutes ago and she said that his body will be lying at the Cathedral from 3 p.m. tomorrow, and the Service will take place between 4.30 p.m. and 4.45 p.m. He will be interred at the Westbury Cemetery on Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, this House will remember the late Garfield Errol Sargeant not only as a Member of the House, but, as the Leader of the House has said, a man who knew his procedure not only in law, but parliamentary procedure because he made himself aware of all that was necessary, and when he ruled, as I have been told, he ruled correctly most of the time.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the few Members of this Chamber, who enjoyed an association with the late Mr. Sargeant before he was a Member of this House and before he was a barrister. I think that I can say, without saying too much, that I encouraged him when he formed his intention to study law; because at that time, many people were not willing to break the tradition of seeking security in the Public Service

rather than taking a plunge into the unknown — the study of law.

The late Mr. Sargeant possessed all the characteristics of a man, a real man. I can remember what I regard as the romantic years when we travelled throughout the island during election campaigns. Those were the years when campaigns were more romantic than in these days. Those were the times when you enjoyed more of life's abundance.

He was always a willing and forthright soul. It was no wonder that when he qualified at the Bar, that he went into the area of Criminal Law, because anyone that was so associated with life in Barbados and who had no pretence about it would be bound to be a capable advocate of people at the Bar. He did that well.

I did not have the honour to serve in this Chamber with him, but I know that he was one who could campaign with ease and comfort and without worry. He told me early before he made his decision that he would not return to politics. It seemed that the aggressive area of politics in these days was not in his field.

The Bar, and generally life in Barbados, will be the poorer for his passing. It is a pity that when we have people of his personality, fate seems to take away those people at a comparatively early age, leaving with us those whom we could well do without; but we have no control over the laws of the Almighty. I would like to share with other Members the sentiments which they have expressed. 12.45 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that each and every Member in here, who knew Mr. Garfield Sargeant, would want to say something about the way in which he conducted the affairs in this Chamber. I am going to be very short, Mr. Speaker, but since the lawyers in here claim their side of it what a great legal luminary he was, since the Member for St. Philip South had the honour of being his constituency colleague and Parliamentary colleague, and since the Member for St. Michael West can also make claims of association with him, I also shall make claim to the fact that he taught me at the elementary school

I can say this, Mr. Speaker, that when he served in this Chamber, he was the Presiding Officer who on one occasion sent me from this Chamber because of my conduct. I am sure that he did this not out of hate but out of strength and his firmness in dealing with matters. I have always admired him, Mr. Speaker, during the years I have known him even as a policeman when I was a very young boy. I can recall that shortly before he left to go abroad to read law he told me "a policeman would always be a policeman, " and he said to me, "I wish you well, keep on the right track." This was just a week before he left. He came back to Barbados as a lawyer and he has made a mark in the field of law. He made his mark also in Parliament and I would like to sum it all up by saying that in any field of endeavour of his choice, he would have been a popular choice. I can truly say that Garfield Sargeant must be admired; he was a popular, nice man. I wish to join my colleagues in the sentiments expressed and also express to his bereaved relatives my deepest sympathy, Sir.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise just to say a few words, but in any case I feel that it would have been impossible

for the House of Assembly to pay tribute to Mr. Garfield Errol Sargeant without my making a contribution. While not knowing Mr. Sargeant for as long as the hon. Member for St. Michael West I am in a position to recall the very striking lawyer which he made. At the Honourable Society of Gray's Inn, our careers ran similarly and I can recall that he was one of the Island's students who was invited from the entire body which comprises hundreds of students, to meet Her Majesty the Queen on the occasion of her visit at Gray's Inn in December, 1959. Our paths diverged. He returned to Barbados as soon as possible to practise his profession while I remained in England, and while there I heard of the tremendous impression he was making in the early 60's in Barbados. When I returned to Barbados he was figuring well as a lawyer in criminal matters, and he and I appeared on more than one or two occasions in criminal cases.

I knew Mr. Sargeant as a Member of this House and I know that he always earned thei greatest respect for the firmness with which he ruled. I particularly recall an instance which occurred when he proceeded once and for all to see to it that all the offensive remarks that were constantly disfiguring debates in the House were so far as possible stamped out, and I think from the day of that debate in which the late Sir Grantley Adams and Mr. Cameron Tudor played a prominent part, there were less offensive remarks made in this Chamber than there were before. Mr. Sargeant ruled without fear or favour and his rulings were almost always correct. He did not sent only the hon. Member for St. James out of the House because of his conduct but he also sent the former Minister of Communications out. He was the first Presiding Officer to take such a step with a Member of the Government.

Perhaps he did not enjoy the demonstration of hostility which unfortunately then arose and perhaps even since his time has been seen to arise. I do not think he enjoyed the hurly-burly of it. He was a member of the Democratic Labour Party in principle but yet contracted close friendship with people of the other side including such people as the late Sir Grantley Adams.

I knew him very well as a magistrate. I do not know if this has yet been said, that all practising lawyers in the House rejoiced to hear of his appointment as a Magistrate because they knew he would bring to the Bench his practical and intense knowledge in criminal matters — a knowledge which the Bench sometimes lacks.

He presided for most of his Magisterial career at Holetown and Speightstown Courts which are Her Majesty's Courts with which I am very well acquainted, along with Sir Theodore Brancker and one or two other Practitioners and I may say that it was always a pleasure to go to Speightstowh because we knew that we would be treated with the greatest courtly and that our points of view would be appreciated. I believe I am correct in saying that, as a Magistrate, he won the respect of many who took part in matters in his court because of his sound judgement and because of his reasonable approach to: the work he had to do. I had the, honour of appearing before him on quite a few occasions and I always realized that his sound judgement was brought to bear on masters which came before him. It came to me as a great shock yesterday when I heard of his death. 12.55 p.m.

I would like to add my support to the mover of the Resolution, and the seconder and the support of the Members of the Opposition. Those of Us who are in the House and who were in the House during Mr. Sargeant's regime as a Member wish to offer our deepest condolences to his wife and other relatives who survived him.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would like to take this opportunity to associate myself with all the remarks, that have gone before. For me, the generosity of the late Mr. Garfield Sargeant and his kindness made him a huge man. To me he was as large as life. I first met him as an "up-and-coming" politician, and indeed were it not for his withdrawal from politics, your humble servant would not now be here most probably, and his generosity as I then experienced steered a course through the constituency which he knew as a politician and which I knew as a parishioner myself.

in the legal profession I endorse wholeheartedly all that was said by the practising Members of the Bar. I found that he was again a very large-hearted man as a practitioner, and as a Magistrate he was a very genial person, a very helpful Magistrate, and his loss will be felt.

On behalf of the constituents that I now have the honour to represent and my family, and myself I too would like to join in paying condolences to his widow and to the Members of his family.

I will now ask hon. Members to stand and observe one minute's silence,

All hon. Members present stood in silence for one minute,

ORAL REPLY TO QUESTION NO. 167

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 167, asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, is now ready.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 6 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting, with the regular assurance, that Private Members' Business will be dealt with immediately after we have got through a certain amount of Government business.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the first Order of the Day under Government Business.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE BARBADOS TELEPHONE COMPANY'S (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1974

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 3 stands in the name of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Telephone Company's Act, 1930,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would amend the Barbados Telephone Company's Act, 1930, in order to require the Barbados Telephone Company Limited to pay in respect of the year 1970 and each subsequent year a fee of \$100, 000 in return for the rights granted to that Company by that Act and any other enactment.

The position, Sir, is that for the last few years, I think as far back as 1969, as a result of numerous meetings and negotiations between the Barbados Government and the Barbados Telephone Company Limited, and after the submission of many relevant documents, papers, and accounts and the examination of these relevant documents, papers and accounts by the Government including the actual amount of receipts in respect of Government telephones and the amount of discount granted by the Barbados Telephone Company Limited, some time in June an alternative was recommended, and it was felt that section 18 of the Public Utilities Act should be amended by way of formulating an agreement between the Company and the Barbados Government for the payment of an annual fee more commensurate than what is paid by such extensive service companies. The fee, after consideration by the Government, was eventually settled at \$100, 000 per annum, which is the fee paid by Cable and Wireless (West Indies Limited) at present, and which has been paid by them for some time. So that in so doing, the Barbados Government is merely bringing in line the Barbados Telephone Company Limited by the payment of an annual fee more commensurate to present day fees paid by service companies of that magnitude.

I do not think I need to labour it too much. I would be willing to give more information which I may have, but that is the gist of the entire matter. One hon. Member asked about discount. As I mentioned, Sir, in June 1971, as an alternative it was recommended that the Ministry of Finance should investigate the possibility of formulating an agreement with the Company for the payment of an annual fee in consideration of all concessions granted to the Company by the Government and ask for certain

information, and the reply read in part: "With reference to your letter dated June, 1971, below is the information requested Year . Gross Discount Net

1966 \$170, 778 \$70, 666 \$100, 112

1.05 p.m.

Year Gross Discount Net

\$ \$ \$

1967 128, 155 19, 224 108, 931

196a 143, 049 21, 458 121, 591

1969 153, 953 23, 093 130, 860

1970 (January 118, 465 17, 770 100, 695 to June) (July to December) 145, 029

Apparently there was no discount that year so the whole amount is \$145, 029.

Instead of giving the discount which had been going on over the years, it was agreed by negotiation between the company and the Government that this annual fee should be charged. This fee is \$100, 000 which is paid at present by Messrs. Cable and Wireless (West Indies) Limited. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill the Leader of the House has been in my suggestion unnecessarily apologetic in the arguments which he has used to justify taxation on a statutory monopoly in Barbados. The Barbados Telephone Company and its affairs have been adequately exposed in a number of public utility hearings, its profit situation is known and courts have ruled on what is a fair return on its rate base and said what its rate base should be effectively, based on the analysed value of the company, and we in this House have no need to apologise for any decision which we take by way of a licence fee to tax the monopoly of the Barbados Telephone Company. It is given certain privileges under the Act of 1930 and we are merely saying that those privileges should be paid for by taxation. I believe that the Telephone Company's lawyers and lobbyists should be congratulated for having been able to force the Government into a corner by saying that if they want to tax them they are not going to give the Government a discount anymore. I do not believe that the discount argument is one, which should be used to persuade hon. Members that they should not be taxed.

There is one quarrel I would have with the form which has been chosen. I would have amended the Bill so as to make it quite clear that this \$100, 000 is not permitted to be one of the operating expenses of the Telephone Company and therefore appears at some future rate case as an expense which the

consumers have to pay by way of an increased telephone rental. This should be a tax on the company and not on the telephone users, and the form in which it has been passed I have no doubt that eventually it will go on to the consumers. In my opinion opportunity should have been seized here and now if necessary by spelling it out in such terms: "This sum of \$100, 000 shall not be taken into account at any rate hearing under the Public Utilities Act, 1951 in support of a claim by die company for a fair return." As it is now, it appears to be a tax on the Telephone Company and in fact it is nothing of the sort, because I heard the Minister say the discount amounted to \$145, 000 one year.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of correction, there was no discount for that year, therefore the gross amount was \$145, 000.

Mr. ADAMS:

I ask the hon. Member's pardon, but as I see it the Telephone Company is saving this discount as the years go on because they are getting the rates increased constantly, and eventually they will not even be paying this \$100, 000 because that will presumably be added to its day-to-day expenses, and that is the view of the Opposition in this matter.

There is some talk about the retroactive effect of the taxation, but I gather from what the Leader of the House is saying that the Telephone Company has agreed by negotiations entered into to accept the determination of the Government in the manner in which it has been brought to the House. I would be glad if my understanding of that is made clear. We in the Opposition say that the Government should be careful that what it thinks that it is taking the Telephone Company, is not a tax all of us will have to pay at some future date by way of yet another increase in the telephone rates.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the Leader of the Opposition in condemning die Government for the method it has sought to levy this \$100, 000 in fees. First of all, my view is that the Public Utilities Act should have been amended long ago, because I say here and now the Government has spent a lot of money and wasted a lot of time, also all the objectors to public utilities in this country have spent money and wasted time when they go before the Public Utilities Board and when they appear before the courts for the objection of rates. As long as the Government provides a system whereby the monopolies which are 90% foreign owned are guaranteed a fixed return of profit, we are wasting time. In a money crisis like this there will be only those companies which- are guaranteed a profit margin and which will make profits. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the Government should have set out in the Objects and Reasons of this Bill that this was bringing into effect an agreement which had been concluded between the Government and the Telephone Company. Parliamentarians who had copies of the Bill before would look — and I looked at it to see what the Government is doing now — and ask whether we were embarking on retroactive legislation. This is a very frightening thing, because nobody knows where they stand if you are going to be taxed for three years before after you have set your business in a particular line.

The Objects and Reasons do not state that this is an agreement which has been reached between Government and the Telephone Company. What about the other people who are thinking about doing business and do not know that this is an agreement between the Government and the Telephone Company? It looks as if this is something we are now being told or if it is something they are hiding

from us. It should have been set out that people would be aware that this is bringing into effect an agreement which has been concluded between the two parties. 1.15 p.m.

All I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I would like to see the Government really revise the Public Utilities Act. I have come here in this Chamber and asked for a rate base for the farmers of this country, die farmers who have to produce food for the inhabitants, and I can get no word. Everyone has to wait for the Ministry of Trade to fix a profit margin to arrive at die price at which to sell commodities; but two monopolies, the Telephone Company and die Light and Power Company, can apply for increased profits and apply for a new rate base.

As the Leader of the Opposition has said, I say that this will be passed on to the consumers. Already we are being taxed or we are paying a fee for a telephone service that does not function. The Public Utilities Board is not carrying out its duties under the Act, an Act which says that a public utility must provide a proper service. There is a penalty in the Act for a utility that does not provide a proper service.

The Member for St. Philip South and I can tell you that the telephone service in St. John and St. Philip is about the worst service you can find anywhere. You can complain morning, noon and night and we have been told that we can do what we feel like. These are things which the Government should look after when they amend this Act. I feel that it is long overdue that the Public Utilities Act should be amended, and the Public Utilities Board should be called upon to do its duties.

These utility services do as they like. They dig up large areas of Barbados and they put up signs asking you to bear with them because they are seeking to provide a better service, I do not believe that 10 per cent of the people of this country will tell you that they have had a better telephone service since the roads have been dug up, or since they have become a part of Continental Service.

As soon as you see 6.00 p.m. and you pick up your telephone you have to wait five or ten minutes before you get dial tone. The Government and the Board are doing nothing about this.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go in for any exaggeration about the telephone service in Barbados, because I do not like exaggeration. It is not fair and true to say that the Barbados telephone service has bran worse since Continental took over. That is nonsense. I do not want to say anything more because I do not want the company to become complacent because you get one person exaggerating and someone else saying that it is an exaggeration.

When you think in terms of 250, 000 people, the Barbados telephone service is a good service relatively speaking, You have to live with the Telephone Company, the Electric Company and the Waterworks Department digging up roads. If they do not dig up roads you cannot get the services improved.

The Leader of the Opposition did not go far enough. He said that this \$100, 000 which the Telephone Company has to pay the Government as a fee is likely to be paid for by the consumers. That is true, but the hon. Member has not said that if this PubMc Utility Company is going to be faced with a recurrent charge as a fee, on what basis can you argue that the recurrent charge should not be taken into account by the company as part of its expenses?

The Public Utilities Act already states what these companies can take into account as expenses. I saw from this morning's newspaper that the hon. Member is representing the Bajan Consumers League, although there has been a row as to who was to represent them. If there is going to be a fee for that representation, that is alright.

I think that the hon. Member on sober reflection would appreciate that the Government would not be acting correctly if they imposed a fee of \$100, 000 as a recurrent charge on the company and then said that it should not be regarded as part of the expenses of the entire operation. I think that the Government would be stepping far out of the crease to have this passed into legislation. It is not a question of capital investment for the Telephone Company which will be a contribution to the Company. You cannot say that the company must pay a fee of \$100, 000 and then ask the law to say that this must not be regarded as expenses.

The Telephone Company is not like an ordinary business enterprise that can make any profit it likes. It is restricted on the capital on which it can make so much profit. I think that the hon. Member after studying it carefully will agree that the fee of \$100, 000 should be taken as expenditure, and to put in legislation to the contrary would be dangerous.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, in considering this matter, I am wondering if the honourable Leader of the House has adequately informed this Chamber as to the true position relating to this matter, whether it was settled between the company and the Government that the fee of \$100, 000 would be retroactive as from 1970.

We are not at all objecting to the payment of the \$100, 000 by the company as an annual fee, but we are much concerned and I think that we ought to be much concerned when we consider that on this day in 1974 we are asked to vote to make it retroactive when it covers from the year 1970; because it has always been held that retroactive legislation is dangerous and must be seen to be dangerous.

However, Sir, if it has already been agreed by the Government and the company that the Company must pay this fee from 1970 and it is alright with the company I do not see where any points of argument can arise. I have been told by the Leader of the House that the company has agreed that it should date from 1970. 1.25 p.m.

However, Sir, we must still warn the Government to keep its eyes opened and to bear in mind that it is not every business person who may be considering investing in Barbados, who would know of the agreement or that this has been agreed upon between the company and the Government to pay from 1970 because, as the honourable Member for St. Joseph has said, this is the type of thing that can upset business in any country. However, I think we can support this.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, since I hold responsibility to some extent, I should like to explain the question of retroactivity. The Government formerly used to get a 15% rebate on all its bills from the telephone company. I appeared for the Government at a hearing in 1970 when this matter went before the court, and the Judge himself said that the fact that the Government was getting 15% on their bills savoured of discrimination but he did not rule out the possibility that the Government should still get other

concessions.

A letter was received by the Government from the Telephone Company dated 24th June, 1970 to the effect that 'we have been instructed by the Public Utilities Board in a letter dated 17th June, 1970 that with effect from 30th June, 1970 we are to discontinue the discount which we formerly gave the Government.' So we were getting this 15% discount and it was stopped in 1970. In the letter they went on to say that they were instructed to inform us that they had come to the conclusion that the discount of 15% then allowed to the Government could not continue after the 30th June, 1970. So that explains the retroactivity.

Since the Government is the largest user of telephones in this country, then the question of retroactivity is explained. In 1970 the court decided that the Government should no longer get the 15%, so there is no question of any retroactivity of the legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER:

Mr. Speaker, in any society care must be taken wherever monopolies exist, particularly if those monopolies operate in the fields of essential services and happen to be controlled by a multi-national corporation. We find this is the case of the Barbados Telephone Company; and with the expertise which these multi-national corporations can have in getting through Government legislation and what not, I think the time is going to come when the Government will have to find people to put on the directorate of all these monopolies which happen to be essential services. In America today, in many States wherever there are monopolies the State Legislators are on the directorate, and, the Government has the right to nominate anyone to serve the public's interest. I believe it may not be too early for the Barbados Government to investigate the possibility of placing people on the directorate of the Barbados Telephone Company, the Barbados Light and Power Company and all these companies which enjoy a monopoly in this country.

The sum of \$100, 000 is too important a sum to consider lightly. In accounting, most accountants are often trained to make a \$100, 000 profit look like a \$15, 000 loss, and unless the Governments in all these developing countries have a good look at what these multi-national corporations are doing and place on their directorates people capable of understanding what the members of these directorates can do, we might every now and again find some underhand things happening. In Barbados the Barbadian businessmen are trying to get smarter. They are submitting bills now and they are rubber-stamped, and they tell you that you will get 10% if paid in thirty days but in my opinion this 10% is even illegal because the Usury Act only allows 8%; and unless the Barbados Consumer League and such organisations have a good look at the attitude of some of these companies in Barbados we may find, what I call, some grossly unfair business practices going on.

The Question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. Speaker left the Chair. The House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. W. R. LOWE took the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed. Clause 3 was called

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable Minister of Communications and Works said, in explaining the \$100, 000, that it is an agreement which represents the discount that the Government was receiving prior to the court case in 1970. 1.35p.m.

I would say that if this is so, then.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation, I never said that. I said that prior to the court case, the Government used to get a 15% discount. I did not deal with any figures nor did I relate them at all. I just gave the figure of 15%.

Mr. WALCOTT:

The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that if this is not paying you, we have to examine the position of the Company. I do not agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he said that the \$100, 000 should be basic and that the rate payers should not be called upon to pay this, but with the explanation made by the Hon. Minister of Communications, this is purely a matter of logic, not a matter of law. If the Chief Justice or the Court says that a Company was discounting you by 15%, it means that the rates were already set, and this does not in any way make any difference with what the rates were. It is just like going to a store and if the price of an article is \$10.00 and you buy it for cash they are going to give you 10%, so you pay \$9 for the item. What the honourable Member said was that when this decision was taken, the Government should not be the loser of this amount of income which it was getting as a result of the discount, and this charge would equate to the income that the Government was losing. What I am saying is that if the Company is now required to make a redress, that is, if the Company saves \$100, 000 or \$X as a result of not giving the Government the discount .that they were giving for "donkey" years, if I may use a Barbadian phrase, then it would be a question of how you would treat the \$100, 000 that we will now get as a fee. If you regard it as an operating fee, really and truly it would not be an operating charge in that sense; it would be a different charge because it would be equivalent to the charge you were making before. If I was given 10% and it equalled \$100, 000 a year, this is what I was giving you anyhow. If you come along and say I will give you \$1, 000 but I will be prepared to use this \$1, 000 for running my business, I would be treated better than I was treated before. The point is that this \$100, 000 is likely to inflict on me an operational charge of an amount which was not there before, because these rates were always there, and this \$100, 000 would appear to inflict a charge on the basis of not giving a discount. I only raise that to say what the position was. If you give a discount as part of your operational business, you do not get that end. Stores cannot take out the discount they give you for operating the business,

The Question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was

read a third time and passed. The title was agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE DEVELOPMENT (CANADIAN LOAN) BILL, 1974

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 2 stands in the name of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to authorise the Government to borrow from the Government of Canada for the purposes set out hereunder a sum of money not exceeding the amount so set out, and for connected purposes.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, the House has already been informed on more than one occasion that I have been negotiating with the Government of Canada for a specific loan for the improvement of the facilities at Seawell International Airport. I would like to repeat again that the relationship which this Government has had with our Commonwealth neighbour to the north has been rather felicitous, and in many ways, although we have never been a colony of Canada, we have been more like part of the Commonwealth, the relationship of the Commonwealth and Metropolitan countries. It is rather astounding that in the independence of Barbados, a country, which has stupidly and ignorantly prided its loyalty, customs and habits and all the other concomitants of colonialism, attached more importance to its connection with the United Kingdom to the extent that they allowed themselves to be referred to as "Little England", and have never really known their true friends. So we had the anomaly that when Barbados achieved independence after a great struggle by the Government Party, after the soliciting of persons in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, the deviates of every description were solicited by the Barbados Labour Party to oppose the Independence of Barbados at that time in 1966. It was not part of the strategy of the United States or the United Kingdom foreign policy that any country in the Caribbean should achieve independence, the Government of Barbados received the independence gift of a silver rose bowl from the United Kingdom.

The Government of Barbados has over \$31 million in Official Reserves in the United Kingdom. Every loan that the Government of Barbados raised was over-subscribed by the United Kingdom investors who realised that they were batting on a good wicket, and certainly so two loans that I raised very early to re-finance the projects which had been undertaken but had not been financed by the previous Government.
1.45 p.m.

I refer specifically to the Deep Water Harbour and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and if you look at the Estimates under the Loans Act, you will see where specific reference is made. These two loans were to pay for projects which they had embarked upon, and they were actually sued for by Messrs. Yearwood and Boyce acting as solicitors for Richard Costain. You will find out why I am saying all of this. Every

time that interest payments are made by Barbadians to people in the United Kingdom that is part of the invisible exports of Barbados, because it affects our balance of payments. We have never defaulted in our payments of interest nor of the principal. There is a superstition in the United Kingdom and amongst the benighted members of the population of this country that the metropolitan country was responsible for the administration and the support of the Government of this country. From the year 1652 the reverse has been correct, that is over 322 years ago.

The people of Barbados have been paying tribute to a lot of administrators and governors in white silk suits and ostrich plumes and we are now paying the pensions of some four or five of these worthy gentlemen who are languishing in the obscurity of conservatism without all the domestic help or all the trappings of colonialism that they were accustomed to during their term of office here in Barbados. The point I am making is a very simple one, and every time I get an opportunity, I am going to make it, because of action which will be taken by the Government of Barbados vis-a-vis the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement and on which I will make a statement. The House will see the strange behaviour of Her Majesty's Government towards the people of this island during the time of my sojourn in this island. We have paid their civil servants though they give us no money for the support or administration, neither have we asked for it, we have never been the recipients of an Exchequer Loan from the United Kingdom. An Exchequer Loan is a loan not made by a Government to a dependent or a non-dependent Government within the Commonwealth, but a loan made directly by the British Government. We have never in the history of this Government been the recipient of such a loan which is really a loan from the British Government direct rather than borrowing from the private marketeers on the Stock Exchange. I think I discussed at length with the then Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1962 the possibility of raising an Exchequer Loan and he said that Barbados was in a fortunate position and did not need Exchequer Loans because people had a lot of confidence in Barbados and that loan would be over-subscribed. Of course I was talking to a Conservative Government so the Exchequer Loans were reserved, but Barbados has never received an Exchequer Loan from the United Kingdom Government.

The reason why I am mentioning it today is to make a contrast between that and the behaviour of Her Majesty's Government in dealing with another reprobate Government in the Caribbean when they not only assured them over \$2.25 million the next three years for independence as a contrast to a simple loan for Barbados for our good behaviour, to give the Leader of that country a personal gift as a bribe of £100,000 to get rid of the country. A bribe of £100,000 was given to the Leader of that country and therefore one must lose all respect for Britain so that I do not want to hear, when I announce formally that no sugar will be shipped from Barbados to the United Kingdom under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement or any other kind of agreement this year, any Barbadian telling me that we are under any legal or moral obligation to the United Kingdom because when they can be guilty of that kind of misconduct I do not recognise that we have any legal or moral obligation to them. (Mr. BOLDEN: Which country?) If the Member for St. Joseph, who is not notorious for his level of information, would read the debates of the House of Lords for 7th December, 1973 he will know what country I am referring to.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Under Standing Order 28 (10) (b) any Member who desires to refer in debate to the character or conduct of any person in his official capacity must deliver to the Speaker written prior notice of the proposed reference; the notice must set out the facts on which such reference will be based and must be signed by the Member giving it. There is only one country in the

Caribbean to which the British Government has given \$2.25 million and the Prime Minister has said that the British Government has given the Leader of that country a bribe of £100, 000. May I ask, you, Sir, if the Prime Minister has given you notice and signed his name as required by Standing Order 28 (10) (b)? This is an accusation by a Government in whose name we have sent a congratulatory telegram.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. Anything mentioned in that Standing Order can only refer to the conduct of this Government and this country.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I think it would be more important that when lawyers are here, they should say who their clients sure. What I am saying is that this is really a straightforward Bill seeking the authority of the House to borrow from the Government of Canada the sum of \$10 million. I am contrasting the inconsistency of the behaviour of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom. What price do you put on respectability and good behaviour by colonials? No price at all, so this country has been dying of respectability under the British and the only way that you can get any kind of recognition from these people is if you are prepared to indulge in a lot of rascality and illegal actions, and this present Government is not prepared to do that. The only rascality we will indulge in is to maximise our export early this year, as the Arabs are maximising their oil exports, and this year I am serving notice that we are going to indulge in a little bit of rascality and I do not find myself in any way committed sentimentally, psychologically, legally or in any other way to Her Majesty's Government, because I consider that they, by their actions, have demonstrated that they are not worthy of any consideration from decent people, certainly not the Conservative Government. It will not make any difference if Mr. Wilson gets in because I belong to the same organisation that he belongs to, and because there are no Freemasonry Meetings in Barbados. I am not a Freemason, Sir, we belong to the same international organisation. I am on the level, Sir, and not on the square.

1.55 p.m.

I must say that I am pleased to see that Your Honour has returned unscathed from your recent expedition.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Was the Rt. Honourable Prime Minister talking about Grenada?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The honourable Member is out of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I am seeking information.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

We are in the position now, in relation to the money we have raised on the money market in London, that we have a very heavy redemption schedule starting by next year; and therefore it would not be feasible for us to go to the London Market for any of the large scale project financing that our development would demand. That is part of the Canadian loan which we are now discussing.

That, Sir, was the reason for my visit during the last few days to Washington to observe the area of operations. We were unceremoniously expelled from the Sterling Area on the 27th of June last year, without any notice although we have a certain guarantee. Unilaterally, the Chancellor of the Exchequer made the decision as far as the Caribbean Commonwealth countries are concerned, and only Ireland would remain part of the Sterling Area although the Irish were shooting down British soldiers in Ireland, and that despite the fact that \$31 million in reserves from Barbados, and other Commonwealth countries in the Caribbean were on deposit, bolstering up the economy of Great Britain.

The only people whom the British were willing to clasp to their bosoms with loops of steel were the very people who are blowing up British soldiers in Belfast. Ireland was vouchsafed the distinction of remaining in the Sterling Area although our money is on deposit in Britain.

I enjoin on other Members of Parliament that they should always read their Bible. There is the text "We brought nothing into this world and it is certain that we will take nothing out of it." "The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away."

As far as this \$31 million is concerned, there should be no great trouble in removing it to a safer place where, I trust, thieves do not break in nor moths corrupt. I used to go to Sunday School and sing in the choir. I did not studiously set out to learn the Bible, it is a matter of osmosis,

If I may be a bit more serious, I hope that we can continue with this kind of exercise along with our other partners in the Commonwealth. It would surprise you to know that if you want to discuss development financing with Her Majesty's Government, you have to "form fours and salute" and see some functionary in the Ministry of Overseas Development, and some Third Secretary and may be someone else in Downing Street and then they will tell you that you will be allowed to spend so much on, say, the library at Cave Hill, when you are talking about \$10 million.

The sum of \$21 million is the largest loan that this Government from the beginning of its recorded history has ever raised at any one time for productive or any other purposes. I have not written a letter to anyone in Canada neither in my capacity as Minister of Finance nor in my capacity as Prime Minister. All that I did was to get on an aeroplane and go to my friends and say that we have an airport expansion programme, "Would you be interested in financing this?"

Sir, I was able to see Mr. Maurice Straughan, who came to see me. He was then the head of the Canadian International Development Association. We discussed the programme. The first time I put my pen to paper for this allocation as far as I remember, was on the 27th September, 1973 when the deal was signed for the loan.

We have never been a colony of Canada and Canada has never been a colony of Barbados. We have a lot of ignorant people in this island, even some are in the House of Assembly. I say that because it is a question of levels of ignorance. I remember that the former Member for St. Andrew said that there is no prescription a doctor can write for what that Member used to call "ignorancy". He was always famous for his pithy sayings.

What I want to say is this. There are a lot of people in this country who do not believe in the

Constitution. There are a lot of attorneys in this country and some of them have been convicted for preaching racial hatred, and they are the persons who should uphold the law.

I know that in neighbouring countries, when people were feeling the pinch, their first reaction to the pressures under which most West Indians have had to live in the past was to go and throw rocks at Canadian banks. If some of the people on the Other Side or some of the misguided Black Power advocates in this country want to do that kind of thing, I want them to come to me first and explain to me which other country in the world they know has been as beneficent to this island as our Canadian neighbours. I know of no other country in the world that can by discussion produce a loan of \$10 million for development in Barbados without the writing of a letter.

Mr. Speaker, I would be lacking in any kind of grace if I did not say that; if I did not recognise the clear distinction in the behaviour of the Canadian Government to this island and the patronising, penurious and derisive attitude to this country at the hands of Her Majesty's Government. Not Her Majesty herself, she is a very gracious lady; but particularly the Conservative Government of Great Britain.- If there is anything I can do to help the Conservative Government lose this election just mention the word to me, and I would even go there and exercise my right to vote. 2.05 p.m.

There are very few occasions when I have praise for Her Majesty's Government. I do not want to get up and criticise Her Majesty's Government, but I like to tell people what I feel about them and this is one of the opportunities that has presented itself. If you look at the Estimates you will see that our Redemption of Debt Charges are still being channelled towards paying for the loans which we have had from time to time. If you look at page 147 of the 1973-74 Estimates at Abstract "F", you will see the expenditure that we have had at the Port Department. The British Government got the contract and they deposited some machinery here at the breakwater which was completely unsuitable for the bulk loading of sugar. The result is that we had to spend some \$400, 000 in providing pumps to pump water from the low lying land. The loan which we got from the British Government meant that we have had to pay interest on \$12, 403, 200 at 6% and on \$6, 139, 200 at .61/4%, and Sinking Fund Charges on a total of \$18, 542, 400 at 2% and instalments on loans raised under the Special Loan Act, 1963—64. This was the last money we raised in England; and to what benefit? The British Government are full of making statements at the UNESCO, at the Food and Agricultural Organization, the International Labour Organisation and at meetings lasting four or five weeks in Geneva, and all the time the British Exchequer treats us like a bunch of school boys who must listen to their Headmaster, and we are like a bunch of students listening to what the deputy headmaster has to tell us. All the time the economy is going down the drain, they are merely treating us to all these lectures about developing countries.

The main point I am making is that Her Majesty's Government in Barbados or the People's Government in Barbados has never received any beneficial Exchequer Loan from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, but what we find now is that we are witnessing a direct loan from the people of Canada to the people of Barbados, and the terms of the loan are not actually in the Bill but I think honourable Members would like to know that according to; the agreement which I signed on the 27th September, 1973, . Barbados will pay interest at 3% per annum on the amount drawn by Barbados. I am sorry I will not be able to see the fulfilment of this obligation because on the terms agreed upon, repayment will start to take effect as from 30th September, 1980 and end in March, , 2003, and by the law of averages I do not expect to be a Member of the House of Assembly at that time. In other words, the Government is being given some twenty three years to pay the loan.

I will add that in the absence of any programme for development on the part of the big countries towards the inhabitants in these poor countries, the people have been given nothing on which to build. They have been squeezed dry and have had to produce without anything beneficial coming to the people of Barbados. 2.15 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, in Article 2 it is stipulated that the loans shall be used exclusively for the purchase of services, materials and equipment which are described in the Act to carry out the project and procedures in relation to the expansion of Seawell International Airport and not otherwise. The agreement itself was signed by the Canadian High Commissioner to Barbados and by me and is available for the scrutiny of Members of this House who would like to see it. The agreement therefore has to be read alongside the very short enabling Bill which was given notice of and the Second Reading of which, Mr. Speaker, I now have the honour to move.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, it has taken exactly fifteen minutes for the Member for St. John and Right Honourable Prime Minister of Barbados to tell this House.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the honourable Member would give way, ...

Mr. GRAIG:

I think it is rather unfair that the Prime Minister has talked as long as he has and has taken his seat and the honourable Member has got up to ask that we suspend for lunch. I am on my feet.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The honourable Member will have an opportunity to speak when we resume.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for one hour.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak on the motion for Suspension. In the first place it is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

As far as the honourable Member's right to speak is concerned, let me assure him that as soon as the Sitting is resumed, he will be allowed to continue his remarks on this matter.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have your assurance that I can speak again, but I have not got the assurance that Members of the Government are going to come back, and therefore I have the right to address the Chamber. They have 18 seats, and we have 6; so we cannot form a quorum. We can appreciate the fact that you have given the House the assurance that I can speak again.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I will point out to the honourable Member that the Bill which I introduced is a Government Bill.

Mr. CRAIG:

I do not know what the Government Members are liable to do. I do not even care what they set out to do. In the first place, the motion is out of order and I would like you to discuss the matter with the Clerk of Parliament before you entertain this motion. You have given the House the assurance that I can come back and address the Chamber, but in the meantime I have no confidence in any of the Government Members, and therefore I am not prepared to give way.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The motion is quite in order.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the hon. Member as I understand it was asked to give way. You can only give way when an honourable Member rises on a point of explanation, other than that, I submit that an honourable Member may rise on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The points are well taken, but the motion is quite in order.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The only motion that can be put on a point of order is the motion "That the question be now put". No motion can be moved at this stage, and the only way the suspension can be taken is to ask the honourable Member who is speaking on the motion to move that further consideration be postponed.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You have made your point of order, and I have ruled.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.

On resumption:

THE DEVELOPMENT (CANADIAN LOAN) ACT, 1974

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the Sitting was suspended, the House was discussing the Second Reading of the Canadian Loan

Agreement Bill and the honourable Member for St. James was addressing the Chamber. The Honourable Member may now resume.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I should like first to congratulate the Leader of the House for the tact which he used in moving the suspension for lunch, because at that time I was in a real fighting mood after hearing the irrelevancies of the Prime Minister in the long, "dog-eared and water-washed" speech which he made in introducing this Bill. I am also sorry that he is not now in his seat, but we are well aware of his attitude of coming and saying things, making statements and then not coming back to the House. That is why I was really hoping that you would not have allowed the motion which I still believe was not in order to be put, with all respect to Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when your children and mine read the debate of 12th February, 1974, and realise that you are the Presiding Officer who allowed the Prime Minister to be so irrelevant, it would be a discredit to you as Presiding Officer. Be that as it may, I am quite sure that you are one of the Presiding Officers who will give a lot of latitude to Members, and I am expecting you to give me the same.

Sir, we heard for some 50 minutes what any journalist outside Barbados would term as a speech filled with emptiness and tempered with rubbish. It took us 50 minutes, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Prime Minister introduce a Bill, and all one could get from it is that the Barbados Government will pay to the Canadian 3% on a \$10 million loan which will start in 1980 and finish in 2003. We heard about independence for Barbados, we heard about the British Government, we heard about another Earl, we heard about the late "Homie" Corbin and we heard every conceivable thing except what was in the Bill.

What I am concerned about in this Bill is the retroactive legislation. If one examines the Bill, one will observe that it is now coming to Parliament for the first time. The Objects and Reasons set out that the Bill would authorise the Government of Barbados to borrow from the Government of Canada for airport development a sum of money not exceeding \$10 million in the currency of Canada. You come to Parliament on 12th February, but in Clause 5 of the Bill we see that this Act shall be deemed to have to come into operation on 27th September, 1973. With all these months going by, Parliament has been treated shabbily by the Government of this country. It is not me they are treating badly, it is the people. One would have expected that with a \$10 million project of this nature for airport development, one would have seen a White Paper or would have had a clear cut picture of how the \$10 million will be spent, because it is made clear in the same Bill that Barbadians are to repay this debt. We have heard absolutely nothing from the introducer of the Bill, and it is a bad thing for the public to be treated in the manner in which it has been repeatedly by the Government. We have been at pains to ask the Government to lay on the Table of this House the Georgetown Accord. We have heard nothing about it. You have seen so often, Mr. Speaker, in the acquisition of land where the Opposition has to come to the rescue of Government by bringing to their notice matters drafted by the legal draftsmen of the country. We have a contribution to make on this side however small it may be. It is reckless, it is wicked and nothing more than what we call the unbridled power of the Prime Minister to be treating Parliament in this manner repeatedly. How can we sit down here today and vote for something which is going to take effect from the 27th September, 1973, when today for the first time we have an opportunity to hear about it, how much interest we are going to pay, what it is for and who is to pay the money back. 3.25 p.m.

This is the attitude of a Government towards Parliament. We are second-hand machinery, we who make the laws in here are the last to know about it, and it is on these grounds that I believe that my colleagues will support me in voting against this Bill. We agree that you must have the development of the airport because it is important to be able to cope with the present jet age. We realise that we have more and more tourists coming to Barbados and there should be airport development but we cannot condone the treatment by Government to Members of Parliament. I am sure that more Members would wish to speak on it and then vote for it, but you heard nothing from the Prime Minister today but fifty minutes of complete rubbish. He has told us that the Government of Barbados is going to start repaying this loan in 1980 and finish in 2003. We are being asked to vote for something which takes effect from the 27th September, 1973 and the first time Parliament hears about it is on the 12th February, 1974. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that if you were on this side, or indeed if you were not speaking as a Member of the Government side, you would have a dim view of the Government in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Please do not bring in the Speaker.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I am quite sure that my colleagues who are interested in saying something on this Bill will probably go deeper into the subject of the attitude of the Canadian Government, the British Government or whoever would be included to assist Barbados in its future development, but my contribution to this debate is directed at the attitude of the Government towards the people of Barbados. They use Parliament as second hand machinery for debating something after they have already made up their minds. I sincerely hope that Members will take a strong view of this and make Parliament what it should be, let it be what it is meant to be and get the respect which is due to it.

I am sure also that each and everyone of us is interested in future development, but what we have to be worried about is the \$10 million (Can.) which the Government of Barbados has negotiated with the Canadian Government. I am reliably informed that the \$10 million (Can.) has been received and the Government has used it in the same way it has used other monies for the purpose of liquidating part of its debts. We are requesting Government not to bring down legislation in future in this manner to Parliament. We have had a similar thing happening with respect to the Coast Guard Service which has now supposed to be coming into operation. It was after they came in here and asked for the money that we asked them for a White Paper and we have heard absolutely nothing about it. This is the attitude which this Government has towards Parliament and the people of Barbados and it will do the country no good. It is my sincere wish that every Member would make sure that Parliament is treated in the way that it should be treated.

The Question that the Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving that Clause 4 stand part, I would like to draw to the attention of the Committee that so far as withdrawals are concerned, under section 301 a withdrawal shall be deemed to occur on the date on which each payment is made by Canada either directly to Barbados or its designated agent or to a firm or banking institution in respect of goods or services supplied for the party. Under section 302, subject to the conditions of the limitations herein set forth, Barbados shall be entitled to withdrawals from the loan in such amounts as are required to meet the reasonable costs of services, materials and equipment eligible for financing as the costs become due and payable. The Canadian Government has ample scope to check on these withdrawals and to come here and examine everything in connection with this loan. Checks are made from time to time and the amounts are advanced in sums of \$200, 000.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 5 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 5 stands part.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

Hon F. G. SMITH:

With all due respect to the hon. Member for St. James, this is not a question of treating the House with disrespect.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member who has just got up made the point at the last meeting of the House that an hon. Member cannot make a Second Reading Speech on a Clause, so at this point, he cannot make any statement on Clause 5.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Point made. I am not prepared to hear the hon. Member.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I have made one sentence. How can he object to something when I have not developed my point?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am prepared to hear the hon. Member on Clause 5.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Clause 5 says that it shall come into effect on a certain date, therefore am I not entitled to talk under Clause 5 on the date? The date is the 27th September, 1973.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am again objecting. Unless there is something wrong with the legal drafting of Clause 5 the hon. Member cannot speak.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Under what rule?

Mr. BOLDEN:

You cannot talk on Clause 5 today. 3.35 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG:

That is a ruling you gave two Tuesdays ago.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I ruled two Tuesdays ago that you could not make a Second Reading Speech on a clause.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I would like to remind you, sir, that two Tuesdays ago when I was speaking on a similar Bill, you ruled that unless there was something specifically wrong with the clause, I could not explain anything in the Clause.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, you said that a Second Reading Speech could not be made in Committee stage.

Mr. CRAIG rose.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I have not yet finished. What I was saying.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

With all due respect to you, sir, is the Member addressing you on a point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

He rose on a point of order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I rose on a point of order. As I was saying, it was your ruling that a Second Reading Speech could not be made during Committee stage and you allowed a Member to speak on the following clause, but not on the general principles of the Bill.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

All I am saying is that the reason why in Clause 5 the date.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I am again objecting.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Member will please take his seat. Two Tuesdays ago I caused this to happen with the Leader of the Opposition and I will have absolutely no fear in doing so now.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make a speech in Committee on Clause 5. All I am saying is that the date in the Clause, 27th September, 1973, is the date on which the Barbados Government signed the Agreement. In Clause 2, you will notice, Mr. Chairman....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, sir. We have already passed Clause 2, and in so far as I know, we cannot reflect on Clause 2 again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is perfectly right. The Hon. Minister will not reflect on Clause 2.

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order. Is there something wrong with Clause 5? That is what I want to know.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

He must not tell me what I must say.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have had sufficient talk from both sides. The Question is that Clause 5 stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order. We are running a House of Assembly. I was voted in here by the people of this country. (ASIDES) As a matter of privilege I have a right to express myself in this House. I will take my seat, but I would express myself. I did not come in here on a wheel barrow or by "hocus pocus".

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

None of us came in here by "hocus pocus". (ASIDES), I rule now and you will abide by this ruling or the alternative will be to leave the Chamber. The Question is that Clause 5 stand part.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have put the question that Clause 5 stand part and you will take your seat. No other person will speak. (Cheers).

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, Sir. With all due respect to the Chair, your mentioning that Clause stand part does not mean that you have put the question, I am submitting to you in all seriousness that your merely saying that Clause 5 stand part is not going to be taken as having put the question.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have put it already. All Members in favour will please say "aye" and those against will please say "no". I declare the "ayes" have it.

The Question that Clause 5 stand part was resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:—

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, Hon. A. MORRISON, Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES and Mr. E.D. MOTTLEY -(11).

NOES:

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. L. S. CRAIG and Mr. W. C. B. HINDS - (3).

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN declined to vote. (1).

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to. 3.45 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper is Item No. 4. This will be introduced by the Minister of Communications and Works, and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1940.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is non-controversial. The whole purpose of the Bill is to increase the fines which may be imposed under the Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1940. The Act was passed in 1940, and this is 1974.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. W. R. LOWE took the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in getting certain information from the Minister of Communications and Works. What I would ask is this. I have received some complaints from officials and others that they now have to pay very much more for ship to shore communications. I wonder if the Minister can give some information on this point as to why these prices should go up. At this time we are only too well aware that fishing boats get lost, and therefore, a ship to shore telephone is essential. I am sure the hon. Member for St. Michael West will give information on this point as to why at a time like this, when cost is going up in the fishing industry as a result of the increased price of fuel oil — not only is it affecting fishing boats and fishing boat owners but also affecting people who are prepared to assist in whatever way possible with the things which are so necessary in the imports of Barbados — why is it thought wise or desirable to increase licences and to increase the penalties for breach of these licensing arrangements thereby causing an increase in the cost of fishing and going to the sea. I would like to hear from the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries whether he was consulted about this.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I cannot really take seriously what the hon. Member is saying in a Second Reading Speech and I refuse to speak on what he has asked about in a Second Reading Speech. I will not reply to a Second Reading Speech at this stage.....

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Is that a reflection on the Chair when he tells you that you do not know what is a Second Reading Speech?.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I am not.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

What he has asked for, is information about these penalties.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Under Clause 2 which has been called, I take it that the Member was speaking on Clause 2. Under Clause 2 the fine is increased from \$100 to \$5, 000. I am speaking on that.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. Member cannot answer the Question or is unable to answer because he is embarrassed, why doesn't he say so?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The Clerk called Clause 2. What are you talking about 'embarrassed'?

The Question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that. 3.55 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to repeat what I said on Clause 2 and ask for an answer on the points. The fines are raised at the same time that the licences are raised and I am asking for an answer, and I will ask the Press and anybody who is listening to take note that the Government does not want to answer the questions about the increase to fishermen.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

In Clause 3 the fee is increased from \$100 to \$5, 000. The fees were set in 1940 when the value of money was nothing and we are now increasing the fines and the value.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would help us by amending the Clause so that we exclude fishing boats from this liability. I wonder if the Minister who is now piloting the Bill through to Clause 3 which excludes wireless .telegraphy used by fishing boats in the fishing industry.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Why ask to do it under Clause 3 when it can be done under Clause 7?

Mr. BOLDEN:

If the Hon. Minister is saying that the Clause is increasing the fine, we are asking that the increased fine be excluded from fishermen and fishing boats, and I am asking him to assist us in amending the Clause.

The Question that Clause 3 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, Clause 4 says that Section 8 of the principal Act is amended by deleting the words "fifth pounds" appearing in subsection (2) thereof and substituting therefor the words "\$500". It should be "fifty" and not "fifth".

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am deeply grateful to the hon. Member, but you do not have to move an amendment for a typographical error.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

It is not a typographical error because it came down in the cyclostyled Bill also.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

If the hon. Member wants an amendment in the House to change "fifth" to "fifty", that can be done.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

If the Minister is so smart, ...

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am not being smart, but it must be clear to anybody that it is "fifty".

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, if I may speak, we are really having an embarrassing situation. The Minister has very grandly said that he is not answering any of these points. The hon. Member should know what is at stake. I chose Clause 2 to speak on. Clause 2, Mr. Chairman, ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am hearing absolutely nothing about Clause 2 which has already been passed. Let me hear something about Clause 4.

Mr. ADAMS:

Well, Sir, while I would like to support the suggested amendment made by the hon. Member for St. Joseph because he is inviting the Minister to move the amendment — perhaps indeed he may think in terms of drafting one — it is difficult to support it, because in fact the section of the Act which deals with ship to shore wireless is section 4 which is already amended by Clause 4 and on which I asked the Minister to say something about the use of wireless in fishing boats. All the Minister says is that Clause 2 has nothing to do with that, but he has not read the Act, otherwise he would know what he was then amending, because what he was amending was the carrying of unlicensed wireless on ships. For that reason it would be impossible for me to support it at this stage, because I do not believe that Section 8 of the Act could reasonably support the amendment dealing with fishing boats. At this stage I would join with the hon. member for St. Joseph if he wants to put an amendment into this Clause of the Act to ask that the words "fishing boat" be added to section 4(3) of the Act so that that section will then not apply to wireless apparatus on any ship, fishing boat or aircraft in the service of Her Majesty or on foreign Men-of-War or Service aircraft. In fact it is not even that section, because there is a section which we have already dealt with, the one he refused to answer which says that no person shall work any apparatus for wireless telegraphy installed on any ship. Let the proviso include fishing boats if he accepts the suggestion. We are not attacking the principle of increasing the fines, so it would not have been proper in the Second Reading Speech to make a specialised point like excluding fishermen, but when you try to deal with it in the Committee stage in a section in which it would have been possible, this is the answer we get. The hon. Member has made a suggestion, and I would ask the Minister to consider it. The same way you can exclude Her Majesty's ships, you can exclude fishing boats.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I do not want to exclude fishing boats. A fishing boat has no right going to sea unless it has proper communications with the shore. Anybody who gets in a boat risks his life when the rudder does not turn

or high seas soak the engine and he may end up under the water. Why should fishing boats be exempted? All this requires is proper communications and any Government should demand that fishing boats carry life belts and all the modern apparatus in order to preserve life. Because they are poor fishermen, should we let them rush to sea and finish with them when they cannot see the lighthouse? I am not going to subscribe to this cheap politics. They must contribute to their own safety. I am not going in for cheap publicity.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of explanation about the matter which was in my speech, the Minister has entirely misunderstood what I said. We want fishing boats to carry wireless apparatus without the undue expense or danger of these terrible fines. We want the wireless machinery on the fishing boats, but not to be subject to these penalties; so he has obviously misunderstood my speech.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, ...

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Member has already spoken.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I have not yet spoken on this Clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Member spoke relative to changing the word "fifth".

Mr. BOLDEN:

It was my learned friend who spoke about that matter. All I want to find out, Mr. Chairman, is the name outside of the person can change it to something else if we pass the words "fifth pounds". If we pass "fifth pounds" in Parliament, it cannot be changed anywhere else except in the Senate and sent back to the House. I do not understand the Minister. If he has not done his homework and does not want to be shown up, let him get up gracefully and admit that he has not read the Bill. I am again calling on the Minister to amend the relevant Act to exclude fishing boats from these large fines which will now fall upon anybody who uses a wireless without having paid the necessary licence. As he has just said, we would like to see fishing boats going to sea with all the possible telecommunications. We would not like to see one fishing boat leaving here unless it is fully equipped. If this is done, I would support the Government on the point that no fishing boat should leave these shores unless it is so equipped that the occupant can be saved in cases of emergency, but I do not want the Minister to keep misunderstanding what we are saying. Diesel has gone up and fishing gear has gone up; so they will have to buy diesel and fishing gear before they pay the licence fee. If they feel they will be caught going to sea with this equipment and have to pay these heavy fines, they will leave the equipment at home and more of them would be lost even more quickly. All I am asking the Minister to do is to exclude the poor fishing boats owners from these large fines which he is now bringing down. 4.05 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the fines payable, there are certain International Regulations which must be observed and I think you must include the fines. I would not even agree with reducing the fines

because under these International Regulations certain periods are to be considered as silent periods and for things like May Day calls made every half hour. Every frequency should be cleared so that emergency and distress calls can get through, but people violate these orders all the time and several lives are lost. Penalties would be necessary to keep the regulations working. I beg to second the motion for the amendment made by the Hon. Minister.

The Question that the word "fifth" proposed to be left out stand part of the Question was put and resolved in the negative without division.

The Question that the word "fifty" be there inserted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Question that Clause 4 as amended stand part was put, and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 5 to 7 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill with an amendment in Committee.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Before you move, Mr. Chairman, I should like to apologise for my outburst, but I felt that there might have been an attempt to infringe on my rights and privileges and I should like to tender my sincere apology.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Your apology is accepted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with an amendment in Committee. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. F. G. SMITH, seconded by Hon. P. G. MORGAN, the Bill as amended was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, Mr.

SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 No. 31

A Resolution for the sum of \$458, 376 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 2 — Services Commissions, Item 20 — Acting Allowances, Payment of Substitutes, the current provision is \$460, 000 and of this amount \$418, 317 was spent. There are commitments to the extent of \$13, 372 and the uncommitted balance is \$27, 898. Originally it was estimated that the average expenditure per month in respect of acting allowances etc. would be in the vicinity of \$38, 353 but due to salary increases with effect from 1st April, 1973 the average monthly expenditure is now \$59, 607 which is an increase of \$21, 000 per month, therefore a Supplementary Provision is required in the sum of \$270, 947.

As far as Item 27 — Travelling — is concerned, the sum of \$900 was originally provided and the expenditure up to October amounted to \$636.14 leaving an uncommitted balance of \$263.86. It is due to the increased travelling allowance rates and car loans for the Chief Personnel Officer. I beg to move that Head 2 stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 4.15 p.m.

Head 4 — Auditor General — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that Head 4 stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The question that Head 4 — Auditor General — stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 7 — Registration Office — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 7, Utilities, I would explain that the sum of \$4, 382 is now requested.

An amount of \$3, 000 was approved in the Current Estimates of Expenditure of which \$2, 741.46 has been spent, leaving a balance of \$258.54. The Registrar says that this balance is inadequate for the efficiency of the Service of this Department.

It includes payment for the cost of electricity and water. There is an additional Xerox Copying Machine which has contributed considerably to the increase in the consumption of electricity. The two machines work simultaneously on a full office time basis. This has necessitated the installation of a new meter and a changing of the wiring system, since the machines are too powerful for the old wiring system, and fuses have been blown from time to time.

Other equipment includes two air conditioning units and one refrigerator for the Registration Office and one air conditioning unit and a refrigerator for the Supreme Court. The sum of \$4,382 which is required to supplement the provision to the end of the Financial Year is arrived at by supply of electricity to the law library from the 26th July, 1973, to the 31st March, 1974 - \$2,400; supply of electricity to the Registration Office for the period 26th July, 1973, to 31st March, 1974, - eight months at \$200 a month, \$1,600; supplying electricity to the Provost Marshal's section, for the same period, eight months at \$30 a month, a total of \$240; water rates for one year at approximately \$100 a quarter.

These additional expenses amount to the sum of \$4,382 now requested, and I beg to move that Head 7 -- Registration Office — stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I heard the Hon. Leader of the House say something about changing the wiring system because the machines are too much load on the existing wiring. For sometime there has been discussion about part of the Registry being moved across the road to the building which once housed the Waterworks Department. I wonder if the Minister of Communications and Works or the Leader of the House could tell us if these plans are afoot on this matter, or if there are any plans to have this matter expedited.

This particular point about the changing of the wiring system in the existing Registry building shows that that building cannot cope with the volume of work which it now has to handle. I think that rather than continually changing old wires and putting in new meters they should utilise the building across the road which may be more equipped to carry heavy duty machinery.

I know that conditions at the Registry are bad. There is serious congestion and books are all over the place. I wonder if the Minister can tell us if any effort is being made to remove this congestion so that there can be proper planning for the new financial year for expenditure on this Department rather than having this piecemeal system.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, the office to which the Member referred is still partially used by the Waterworks Department. We hope to move its present activities over to the Rates and Taxes Division. As soon as we can move out, the building will be ready for the Registry. The Chief Justice and the President of the Bar Association know about it.

I have asked my technical section to expedite the matter in order that the congestion mentioned by the Member for St. Joseph can be relieved at the earliest possible time.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I wonder if it is not possible that part of the Registry could be moved over, and the two Departments, the Waterworks and the Registry use the building as it stands now until the Waterworks Department has been moved out. It is quite a big building. It has an upstairs section and a bottom section, and I wonder if some arrangement could be made whereby the pressure on the Registry could be removed now rather than waiting until you move out the Waterworks Department altogether.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I promise the hon. Member that I will be looking into that aspect also and that the Chief Justice and the Registrar should have a look at it to see if they would be willing to agree to the move. I suspect that some sort of renovation will be necessary.

The Question that Head 7 - Registration Office — stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 8 — Crown Solicitor's Office — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, under this Head, Item 10, Office Expenses, the sum of \$1, 360 was provided in the Current Estimates for the Crown Solicitors's Department. That amount has proved totally inadequate owing to the increased cost of stationery, the cleaning of the office and the maintenance of furniture and equipment.

At the 31st August, 1973, the sum of \$799.27 was spent leaving a balance of \$560.73. The Crown Solicitor is now responsible for conducting proceedings in court for the recovery of outstanding sums due to rates and trade taxes under the Local Government Act of 1958. It is estimated that an additional \$500 is required to the end of the financial year.

I beg to move that Head 8 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The Question that Head 8 — Crown Solicitor's Office — stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 25 — Ministry of External Affairs --was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 25, Ministry of External Affairs, this represents contributions and voluntary pledges to International and Regional Organisations. (ASIDES Mr. Sandiford has the file.) 4.25 p.m.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 25, Item 67, I would like to point out that as the Note to

that Head states, Supplementary provision of \$12, 000 is sought under Head 25 — Ministry of External Affairs, Item 67 — Contributions and Voluntary Pledges to International and Regional Organisations, to pay Barbados' contribution to the Commonwealth Youth Programme for the year 1973-74.

During the course of last year, a Commonwealth Youth Conference was held in Zambia and as a result of that particular conference, a seven-point youth programme was mapped out and these proposals were subsequently adopted by the meeting of Ministers of the Commonwealth. The programme calls for, among other things, the establishment of youth training centres in certain regions of the world; there will be Commonwealth Youth Service Awards, a Commonwealth Fellowship Programme with particular reference to youth matters, bursaries for youth personnel in the Commonwealth and a Commonwealth Study Fellowship for youth.

The Government believes that this programme should make a considerable impact on the problems relating to youth and in development programmes in which youth in the region can contribute and participate. We have worked out our contribution to this programme on the basis of the overall percentage programme of the budget of the Commonwealth Secretariat and that has come out as a figure of some \$12, 000.

Sir, I beg to move that this Head 25 stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The Question that Head 25 - Ministry of External Affairs — stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 33 — Ministry of Communications and Works — was called.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, as all hon. Members are aware, the rates of the Barbados Telephone Company were increased with effect from 1st April, 1973. It was not possible to make provision in the Current Estimates to meet the increased rates. The sum of \$325, 000 was provided in the Current Estimates for telephone expenses. Well, the rates have been increased again with effect from 1st January, 1974. It has also been found necessary during the course of the year to install additional telephones in Ministries and Departments to enable them to cope with expanding requirements.

The amount, in view of these two increases, since the January figure was sent down has proved inadequate, and it is desirable that Supplementary Provision of \$100, 000 be provided to meet the cost of telephones for which the Ministry is responsible to the end of the current financial year.

I beg to move that Head 23 stand part. Hon.A, MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The Question that Head 33 - Ministry of Communications and Works — stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 38 -- Ministry of Health and Welfare -was called,

Dr, the Hon.R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 38 stand part.

Hon.A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The Question that Head 38 -Ministry of Health and Welfare — stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 42 — Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 42 - Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce, I would point out that there were five items. The first is Item 33 — Books and Publications — for the sum of \$100; provision for the sum of \$400 was previously made for this Item. The next Item is Item 35 - Utilities - for which \$2, 400 is required, and provision under this Item for the sum of \$1, 500 was previously made. The reason for this is that the basis, on which the electricity figures was fixed, proved inaccurate.

The next Item is Item 40 — Communications — for the sum of \$1, 557. The sum of \$1, 750 was previously provided for this Item but this proved inadequate in that the sum of \$3, 307 was the total required. The sum of \$1, 557 is now required for the expenditure for the balance of the year.

The next Item is a new Item; it is Item 42A — Caribbean Investment Corporation for the sum of \$45, 000. This is Barbados' contribution in connection with the Caribbean Investment Corporation as explained last week. This is the contribution which Barbados has to make in keeping with the agreement recently made in Guyana.

The other Item, Mr. Chairman, is Item 44 --Furniture and Equipment — for the sum of \$2, 375. Additional permanent posts were created for the Ministry of Trade by Resolution 38 of 1972 on the 8th November, 1972, and this amount will provide the necessary furniture and equipment for the permanent staff.

Sir, I beg to move that Head 42 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is time that we should make some attempt to find out what the Ministry of Trade is doing with the books they are supposed to be spending money on and what benefits they are getting from publications and what not, I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you are as unhappy as I am over the way that the Ministry of Trade is handling its affairs — the affairs of this department in general. 4.35 p.m.

I believe you have observed quite recently that there is not now that contact, so to speak, with the Ministry coming from certain quarters, because it is now generally accepted that the operations and functions of the Ministry as a whole came to be part and parcel of the big business in this country. I am sure that all of us in this Honourable House must have had cause to read and enquire about an item which appeared in the Daily Press of this Island not so long ago signed by Pat Castagne, and I am sure that everybody had reason to try to find out what "Shoo fly, don't bother me" really meant. Anybody who has the interest of this country at heart on an enquiry into this and learning what that expression meant would come to the conclusion that it is enough that we should see a thorough investigation into the operation, functioning and general administration of the Ministry of Trade in this country.

We would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that after the Ministry has read all these books and publications and made all these overseas telephone calls that we would be given some idea as to how to secure our position, but we are just being made toys of, by the Ministry of Trade generally, and the poor consumers in this country are being taken for a ride in every possible respect. The Government ought to know that within another few days the distributors of bottled gas are going to stop distributing. We know that throughout the years there have been repeated increases to consumers, but there have been no corresponding increases to the distributors at the gasoline stations and other small outlets, and one particular feature is that the gasoline stations which handle the empty bottles which cost \$10 do not get one cent profit for handling these bottles, yet they are called upon to pay cash or are given short credit terms, and it is a question of just giving their sweat and blood to make money for the big business, and the consumers of this country are going to be the poorer for it because as soon as the distribution is stopped by the gasoline stations, we do not know what the people who depend on bottled gas are going to do. I believe the Ministry of Trade ought to have taken some action long ago to protect the consuming public from a situation such as this.

It is hardly necessary for me at this stage to touch on the question of gasoline, because you will agree with me that the handling of the gasoline problem by the Ministry of Trade is costing this country millions upon millions of dollars daily because there is a lack of production on the part of every person who has an interest in getting petrol in his or her vehicle. If the Ministry of Trade investigates the agreement signed between the Government and the British Union Oil Company, now called Mobil and follows things step by step until this present day it must be concerned with such things as Esso, Texaco and Shell Stations, because they mean nothing to us in Barbados today. All they mean is that somebody has been keeping these signs up in order to get a profit on the gasoline and causing it to cost much more to the consuming public. These are matters the Ministry of Trade should clamp down on and let us understand exactly what is the true position because all the gasoline that is sold at the various gasoline stations comes from Mobil. Mobil itself has about 13 or 14 stations, and Shell, Esso and Texaco buy from Mobil and merely use these stations that bear their name to make money for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Ministry of Trade has been very concerned with the three-tier system of trade in this country. Some of these concerned have agents, like Messrs. Plantations Limited to look after the distribution which means that there is another hand being put into the business, and Messrs. Plantations Limited are not going to distribute Shell for the love of distributing it, to the poor consumers of Barbados. They are going to get a profit from handling it. Mobil manufactures the gasoline and distributes it to its own station, and if it is a case where Mobil is distributing to its own station at the same price as other people who employ agents are doing, then you will find exactly who is

making money and whether or not it is fair and just to be asking the consuming public to pay the price that it has to pay for kerosene oil. You know, Mr. Chairman, how many increases have been put on kerosene oil during the last two weeks, and this commodity is used by the poor person who has a kerosene stove in order to get a warm meal when he gets home, (Hon.P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, what mm is this?)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

We are dealing with Head 42.

Mr. HINDS:

I am saying that the Ministry of Trade can learn from the books and publications which they are acquiring and apply a little commonsense. Some people tried to get 22 acres of land for nothing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There is nothing about land in this Resolution.

Mr. HINDS:

I said that some people tried to get 22 acres of land for nothing, but the poor consumer is burdened in trying to get a pint of oil, and the Ministry of Trade should do something to stop this wasting of time and the conditions under which these people find themselves at present at the gasoline stations. Whoever is concerned that this has nothing to do with the Resolution, let him get in the Chair; but we are dealing with the question of a utility. For instance when it comes to the question of furniture and equipment for shop inspectors and the like, we do not need all of this because you want the inspectors to be in the shops and supermarkets, but as I have already said, the consuming public in this country is not sufficiently aware of all that is going on in trade in this country. 4.45 p.m.

I will tell you this. We are now satisfied that big business has a very direct controlling influence and interest in the Ministry of Trade. You will see, Mr. Chairman, that the Nation Newspaper used to attack the Minister of Trade and his handling of the Ministry, but there was a meeting at which the President of the Barbados Manufacturers' Association, the President of the Chamber of Commerce, Mr. K. R. Hunte, and some of the people from the Nation Newspaper were present and the Nation pledged to sell its soul to these people and you will never see it again attacking the Minister of Trade. They might attack him next Saturday after hearing what I have said, but they have pledged their soul to get into the big business, That is why we cannot respect some of these people who are in this kind of business, I believe it is. time we should have an investigation into all of this.

One other point I wish to make. We heard a lot of talk about the Prices Commission. Prices affect us and what the people at the Ministry of Trade should do is to see how prices relate from other countries to Barbados, but you will find that we have just had a change in the Chairmanship of the Prices Commission but we have not been removed far enough because some of these same people that you now put to administer these affairs are the very people from places like BIMAP, You will find in the Minutes of BIMAP, which has been given grants and loans from overseas, that these same people are the people who made attempts to take the funds of BIMAP and pay for their entry into places like the Bridgetown Club. If they would sell themselves with BIMAP's money to get into these social clubs, what do you think they would do when they are part and parcel of the Prices Commission? The Government should investigate all these things. We have got to have people who have the interest of the consuming public at

heart, not to secure their own social position in clubs and in big company, and we are prepared to say that they have shown themselves in other organisations as willing to sell themselves again and again to attain all this, and it should not be done at the expense of the consuming public, We ask the Government to look into these matters.

The Question that Head 42 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 43 — Ministry of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance — was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, there is not very much I can add to these notes on Items 30 and 43, and I beg to move that Head 43 stand part.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the Minister's attention that under Item 30 the sum of \$, 600 is required to meet the increased cost of cleaning and servicing Marine House consequent upon the increased use of the building for conferences, seminars and other public functions. I would like to say that the main function of the Ministry of Labour is labour, but there are inadequate facilities for conferences on labour in the Ministry of Labour. When there are big meetings, the Minister of Labour does not have adequate facilities for industrial relations conferences.

The recent problems we had with the Hotel Association necessitated holding many meetings and we had the problem of having to go to one of the hotels for the Chief Labour Officer to preside over a public meeting. That was his meeting and he had to ask the hotel to allow him the use of a room in that building. There is nothing wrong with occasionally having to go outside, but I think a Ministry of Labour in an island like Barbados must as a matter of priority have adequate and ancillary facilities for holding conferences. In the office of the Minister at Marine House there is a room which is not big enough for industrial meetings, it is all right if you have a dozen people or so but not for about 30. The Department of Labour has been going on in Barbados for over 30 years and I am one of the people who believe that the Government in power — and in both Parties the operative word in the name is "labour" — now find that labour facilities are regarded in such a manner that we should labour and not have the facilities which should be associated with a labour organisation. I do not believe in these poor shabby facilities operating around- meetings. Meetings should be held in excellent facilities because people's tempers flare sometimes when they have to sit at long and tiresome meetings, and I think the time has come that we should have excellent facilities for holding these meetings.

I do not like the facilities provided at the Labour Department, this is an old fashioned building which was the property of the Badleys and somebody felt it was better to use some of these old houses than to construct something which is more appropriate to present day needs. You cannot run an office in an old fashioned dining room with an old fashioned wash basin which was put in in 1908. I feel that you have to get buildings more appropriate for what we are doing today, you cannot administer a building when you have to press a button and then make a search in a cellar for a man. The time has come to have modern buildings, and I am speaking as a man who has had dealing with labour for over 25 years and I feel the

Ministry of Labour must have a building for industrial relations conferences and meetings, which is appropriate to what is taking place in Barbados today. 4.55 p.m.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, when the dispute with the Hotel Industry took place late last year, I happened to be away from my office on sick leave. I am surprised to hear that meetings had to take place at a private hotel. There are at least three areas where large meetings, using the same terms as the Member for St. Michael-West used - 25 to 30 people can be held.

I have had meetings with people including the Barbados Workers' Union in my own conference room at Marine House. That, however, is not what I would suggest. There is an area used as the board room for the Tourist Board where such meetings could be held and where I think meetings were held under the chairmanship of the Chief Labour Officer when they were discussing the matter on the Sanitation employees; but there is also a large room on the ground floor of Marine House which is used for lots of conferences.

I do not know if at the time that the discussions were taking place under the chairmanship of the Chief Labour Officer, both rooms — the room generally used for conferences at Marine House as well as the open area, the ball room, — were being used at that time. Of course, the open ball room might not be suitable because if tempers were frayed, some enclosed room would be more suitable.

Sir, we are now constructing, as Members know, a new office block in Fairchild Street which will have adequate room for conferences, and I believe that in that office block we will have the kind of conference accommodation that I think the Member for St. Michael West would be proud of.

The Question that Head 43 — Ministry of Housing, Lands and National Insurance — stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$458, 376 do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 NO. 32

A Resolution for the sum of \$697, 332 was called.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$697, 332 do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Minister did not call the Head.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There is one Head.

Mr. HINDS:

I do not want to hear that I cannot rise again and say anything.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, you have Sub-Head 1, General Administration, Sub-Head 2 Health Services and so oh.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I moved that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

It cannot be done that way.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, I would draw your attention to Standing Order 66(2) dealing with Procedure in Committee of Supply.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. This is a Resolution for a sum of money and it is a single Resolution. There is no point looking at any Standing Orders. It is Head 38 which calls for a vote of \$697, 332. If the hon. Member moved it as this amount that is all he has to say. We cannot ask him to move that item this or that stand part

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am thankful for the hon. Member's explanation. I think that I have been in here long enough to know that in Committee of Supply when you are dealing with a Head, the Head must be called.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 38 stand part.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that. Mr. Mottley rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You have the option to speak for 15 minutes on Head 38.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Under Head 43 which we just discussed — I am not discussing that — but if you look at the Estimates as originally passed you will see that Head 43 is broken down in the Estimates.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is no point at all.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

If the Prime Minister wants to speak, I will give way.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I am on a point of order. Let him sit down.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The hon. Member called my name.

Mr. HINDS:

I object to that kind of behaviour on the part of the Prime Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I am on a point of order, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am willing to hear it. 5.05 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Under Head 38, Mr. Chairman, if you look at the Resolution you would say that under Head 38 — Ministry of Health and Welfare - there is No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. As far as I know the practice has been that these are dealt with separately.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have already ruled. I have a Resolution here dealing with Head 38. There is absolutely no Head here before me other than Head 38.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, if you look at Head 38 you will see under the Head there is (1) General Administration. If you turn to the other page you will see Ministry of Health and Welfare, (2) Health Services. If you go further down the page you will see Head 38 — Ministry of Health and Welfare - (3) Maternity Hospitals. If you turn the page you will see Head 38 — Ministry of Health and Welfare (4) Lazaretto. After that you will see Head 38 — Ministry of Health and Welfare - (5) St. Michael's District Hospital. If you turn to the next page you will see Head 38 - Ministry of Health and Welfare -(6) District Hospitals. If you turn to the next page you will see Head 36 — Ministry of Health and Welfare - (7) District Medical Services. Now if you are advised by the Clerk, what should be done is that you should call Head 38(1), Head 38 (2), Head 38 (3), and so on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

However, I am dealing with Head 38. That is what is in this Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

But don't you see under Head 38 one line which bears the statement (1) General Administration, and it goes on with 2, 3, and so on.....

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, I do not like this argument that is going on with you.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

At present three Members are standing. Will all three sit down. If no hon. Member is willing to speak on Head 38, I will put the question.

Mr. HINDS:

I understand you to rule, Mr. Chairman, after consultation with the Clerk, that the Head must be put.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Question is that Head 38.....

Mr. HINDS:

That is not correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

It is not a Question of being correct or not correct in this instance.

Mr. HINDS:

As it has been passed in this Session, it was passed as Head 38(1), Head 38(2), Head 38 (3) and so on. That is the proper way of putting it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is in the Estimates. But you are not going to argue with the Chair any longer.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, you are to rule. There should be no argument with you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Three hon. Members are standing. Will all hon. Members sit, please. I have already ruled that we will deal with Head 38 — Ministry of Health and Welfare - in this Supplementary as to one Head. When you come to deal with the Estimates they will be dealt with as set out. Since they are not set out in this manner as you are trying to say, I can only deal with them as I am dealing with them.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. You have just said that when we come to deal with the Estimates we will deal with them as set out. There are set out in the same manner in the Estimates as they are here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You will have the option to speak for fifteen minutes.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, you have given two rulings. If the notes are checked it would be seen clearly that you gave two rulings on this particular matter in the course of the last few minutes. You will see that if you checked the Reporters' notes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am ruling that Head 38.....

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, you mean to tell me that the hon. Member who is the Prime Minister can go behind you and carry on whisperings like this? Is this a new way? Is what the Prime Minister doing, right? Call the Marshal.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to the fact that the Prime Minister is standing behind you and interrupting you. Is it right that the Prime Minister should be standing behind you and interrupting you? If he is waiting for Mr. Mottley, Mr. Mottley will come outside and meet him.

Mr. HINDS:

You know what stands in the defence of the Opposition today? What stands in the defence of the Opposition today is that you are Chairman and you can read and write, and that being so, I am confident that you must have some appreciation for what we are saying on this side. 5.15 p.m.

Here we have Head 38 - Ministry of Health and Welfare (1) General Administration, then we have Head 38 - Ministry of Health and Welfare (2) Health Services. I need not go any further, but it goes on like this. The point I am trying to make is that the reason why these are set out under these specific sub-heads is for an honourable member to do justice, and I believe the Ministry of Health would like to know that justice is done to every item under this Resolution. For these items to be taken en bloc as an effort is now being made to do, an hon. Member could never make a full contribution in fifteen minutes. We are making a mockery of Parliament, and I am sure you are the last person who would want to see this done to our Chamber, Mr. Chairman. It is for this reason that I am asking you to stick to the ruling you gave in this matter. Your first ruling is that the sub-heads should be dealt with separately.

Mr. Chairman, it is now known and it must be accepted that the Members of the Government are seeking to deny the Opposition an opportunity to speak for fifteen minutes on each Sub-Head. A few minutes ago it was drawn to the attention of the Chamber that there was another item under Head 47, but in view of the fact that we were not going to offer any objection to it, we allowed it to pass. It is not fair to us that in a Resolution of this magnitude Members are not given an opportunity to make a worthwhile contribution. (Hon. P. M. GREAVES: We follow rules.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have already ruled. The Resolution is for Head 38.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, I claim to move that the Question be put.

Mr. HINDS:

I am on my feet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN; The hon. Member has made his point. Is the hon. Member prepared to speak on the Resolution?

Mr. HINDS:

I am only too glad to do so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Well I want to hear you, otherwise I will have to put the question.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to you, can I draw your attention to one thing? I have before me a copy of the Minutes of the proceedings for the House on the debates of the Estimates. Here you will see...

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

But I have already ruled and my ruling stands.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I just want to draw something to your attention.

Mr. HINDS:

In ruling on this matter you said you were in here long enough, and this is what the hon. Member is drawing to your attention.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I am drawing to your attention the procedure you adopted during the Estimates. Here I have the Minutes where you have Ministry of Health and Welfare (1) General Administration for the sum of \$5, 574, 108 was called. We dealt with that. Then you had Head 38 - Ministry of Health and Welfare (2) Health Services, and so on. That is the same way it is set out today in this Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have already ruled, and I will time from now on any speech you make.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I do not want to have any argument with you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The question is that....

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. HINDS rose.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I want to draw something to your attention.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have already ruled and my ruling stands.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Can I suggest this to you? Would you like to be advised by the Clerk-at-the-Table?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There is no more advice the Clerk can give me. I have already ruled.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

This is wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You cannot tell the Chair that it is wrong.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Why is it that when the Opposition Members try to draw something to your attention you do not accept? I am asking you to accept the advice of the Clerks-at-the-Table.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The decision of the Chair is final and without redress except on a substantive motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. HINDS and Mr. FORDE left the Chamber.

The Question that the Resolution for the sum of \$697, 332 do now pass, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74

No. 33

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$415, 521 do now pass.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 5.25 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUS SON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Money Resolutions in Committee of Supply. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the three Money Resolutions were read a first, and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this now concludes Government Business for today's Sitting. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn till Tuesday next, 19th February, at 12 noon.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 5.26 p.m.